

# Rules of Speech Behavior in Tatar and Turkish Proverbs

Iskander Zhamilovich Edikhanov<sup>1,\*</sup>, Guzel Amirovna Nabiullina<sup>1</sup>, Renat Islamgarayevich Latypov<sup>1</sup> and Akarturk Karahan<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of General Linguistics and Turkology, Institute of Philology and Intercultural Communication, Kazan Federal University Kazan, Russia; <sup>2</sup>Department of the Ancient Turkic Language of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences of the Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University, Ankara, Turkey

**Abstract:** Today, despite the abundant supply and scientific papers concerning particular features of multi-method, communicative culture and comparative linguistic research on the ethnocultural stereotypes of Turkic peoples' communicative behavior, it is vital in modern linguistics. The issue statement is because the ethnocultural examination of the Turkic peoples' communicative behavior permits us to look at the ethnos' communicative culture in the modern context and distinguish typical and distinctive characteristics of the Tatar's communicative culture Turkish peoples. This survey investigates the ethnocultural stereotypes of the communicative behavior of the Tatar and Turkish linguistic cultures expressed in the paroemiological fund. The analysis is based on the Tatar and Turkish languages' phraseological and paroemiological units within this article's framework. The research adopted descriptive, stylistic, and comparative techniques. Moreover, The methodological framework is the linguoculturological, cognitive-linguistic aspects of the investigation of paroemiological units. The most substantial typical categories of the Tatars' communicative culture are the culture of communication, politeness, sociability, verbiage, silence, conflict communication, and effective communication. In paroemias, truth is proclaimed before lie, laconicalness before loquacity, silence before speaking, deed before the word, listening before speaking. The examination of stereotypes of communicative behavior reveals that the Tatars persist faithfully to the observance of folk traditions and particular speech cultures.

**Keywords:** Ethnocultural Stereotype Speech Behavior, Speech Culture, Turkish Ethnic Cultures, Tatar Cultures, Paroemiological Fund.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Communicative culture is an essential component of the spiritual culture of souls. Communicative culture is built on commonly accepted moral conditions for the communicative behavior of an ethnic group. Communicative behavior is defined through values; ethics laws inherent in each ethnic culture (Gilazetdinova *et al.*, 2014). Obstacles to analyzing communicative behavior and communicative culture involve numerous inquiries associated with people's intercultural communication and language competence (Dunbar, 2003; Wierzbicka, 1992; Quasthoff, 1978).

Lately, in contemporary linguistics, investment in considering the national aspects of linguistic means of showing communicative norms and behavior has risen. In Turkology, in recent decades, several monographic sociolinguistic, ethnolinguistic, linguoculturological studies of stereotypes of speech culture have emerged (Abdulin, 2006; Isina, 2008; Kuznetsov, 2004; Saifullina, 2009). Of distinct interest is comparative knowledge of stereotypes of Turkic peoples' verbal communication as ethnocultural stereotypes in this scene have not been examined in science ever earlier.

As you know, paroemiology and phraseology reflect the specificity and originality of Language, culture, structure, tradition, history, mentality, and stereotype of the linguistic consciousness of the ethnic group. They convey national character, historical, and ethnocultural flavor. Paroemias and phraseological units are the means of expressing a stereotype associated with developing a people's culture. Analyzing these linguistic units, we can represent life, the mentality of the people.

According to non-applied research, it can be argued that significant results on the linguistic study of paroemias and phraseological units have been achieved. However, the problems of studying these language units in ethnoculturological terms remain less understood. This paper aims to examine the ethno cultural stereotypes of the Tatar and Turkish linguistic cultures' communicative behavior in the paroemiological fund. The research's subject is the Tatars' ethno cultural characteristics and the Turks' stereotypes of speech behavior. The research element is Tatar and Turkish proverbs (Underwood (2015).

The study's connection is determined by the fact that a ethnoculturological survey of the Tatar and Turkish peoples' communicative behavior enables us to reassess the ethnos' communicative culture in the modern context and reveal typical and distinctive

\*Address correspondence to this author at the Department of General Linguistics and Turkology, Institute of Philology and Intercultural Communication, Kazan Federal University Kazan, Russia; Tel: +79625615702; E-mail: khayb.aa@mail.ru

features of the communicative culture of the Tatar and Turkish peoples. The investigation of communicative behavior based on paroemias explains the ordinary rules of an ethnic society's communicative behavior, which is more prosperous, more distinct, and more precise than various modern primary theories of effective communication (Sibgaeva *et al.*, 2016; Sibgaeva *et al.*, 2017).

Proverbs express a stereotype since they exhibit the people's culture in their semantics, conduct national character, historical, as well as cultural coloring (Mugtasimova *et al.*, 2014; Jobo, 2016).

The study's objects are Tatar and Turkish proverbs and phraseological units expressing communicative categories of speech behavior. The dictionaries of proverbs, explanatory and phraseological dictionaries, phrasebooks, literary works, as well as online dictionaries were the sources of our research.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Many researchers have studied the subject of this article. R.G. Busnel performed the first scientific study on Turkish Whistle language with his research team in 1967 (Busnel, 1976). They performed recognition tests in Kuskoy with spoken and whistled words, including isolated words and sentences. The recognition tests were performed in terms of word, sex, age, and identity recognition. The details of these tests can be found in (Busnel, 1976). Tatar is also native to several thousand Maris. Mordva's Qaratay group also speaks a variant of Kazan Tatar. In the 2010 census, 69% of Russian Tatars who responded to the question about language ability claimed a knowledge of the Tatar language. In Tatarstan, 93% of Tatars and 3.6% of Russians did so. In neighboring Bashkortostan, 67% of Tatars, 27% of Bashkirs, and 1.3% of Russians did. S.G. Ter-Minasova has underlined the importance of the language comparison: "We can clearly see a barrier between languages, but a barrier between cultures can be only seen when a native culture collides... with another, different, culture". In the thirties and forties of the last century there emerged an idea to look at the comparative method from a linguistic point of view.

The following scientists contributed to its development: Koneva (2014) and Underwood (2015) say: However, this will require further research on Kushdili. The number of those who communicate this Language is now about 10,000, and it is rapidly decreasing, as mobile phones replace communication by whistling.

They began to be used as the primary means of communication. According to Güntürkün, one of the reasons for the disappearance of Kushdili is the fact that it is more fruitful to whisper or communicate with your lover using a mobile phone than to do it via whistling for the whole valley can hear the whistle. Güntürkün *et al.* (2015) say: Whistled languages represent an experiment of nature to test the widely accepted view that language comprehension is to some extent governed by the left hemisphere in a rather input-invariant manner. Indeed, left-hemisphere superiority has been reported for atonal and tonal languages, click consonants, writing, and sign languages. Whistled Turkish uses the full lexical and syntactic information of vocal Turkish and transforms this into whistles to transport complex conversations with constrained whistled articulations over long distances. Whistled language comprehension relies on symmetric hemispheric contributions, associated with a decrease of left and a relative increase of right hemispheric encoding mechanisms. The results demonstrate that a language that places high demands on right-hemisphere typical acoustical encoding creates a radical change in language asymmetries. Thus, language asymmetry patterns are in an important way shaped by the physical properties of the lexical input.

Safin *et al.* (2016) say: Many countries have begun to learn the Language of whistle in the scope of science. For example, at the Ruhr University of Bochum (Germany), a new study shows that the brain processes Kushdili far otherwise than spoken Turkish. Kolosova (2016) says: It is interesting that in Turkish, there are 32 letters and the corresponding number of sounds, which is in contrast to the Language of the whistle, which has only six phonetic sounds. Actually, Kushdili is not a direct reflection of the Turkish Language, but only its "part". It is essential to study the mechanism of whistling of the residents of Kuskoy in order for the whistle language to turn from the "part" into the "full". The origin of the Language of the whistle was purposeful for short long-distance communication. In this connection, Kushdili is a kind of not full Language. If we parse the speech of the inhabitants, we will see that what seems to be "not full" for strange listeners is "superfluous" for the residents themselves. Let us consider the sentence "ben geliyorum (I am going)" in terms of the grammar of the Turkish Language. In this sentence, a "redundant" component will be "ben", for the ending, "um" already stands for "I". Therefore, if there is only one-word, "geliyorum", one will understand that "I am going".

Ozaydin (2017) says: This paper presents the acoustic and linguistic properties of Turkish Whistle Language. Whistle Language is a natural communication method usually used for far-distance interaction in some regions of the world. In a whistled speech, auditory features of spoken languages are transposed. Therefore, whistle languages carry some vocal speech properties with their own vocabulary, grammar, phonology, and prosodic features. A few places in the world using this whistled communication style and Kusköy region in Turkey is one of them. Although there are some researches on the Turkish Whistle Language, unfortunately, there have been a limited number of scientific publications in the literature. On the other hand, the research results present very stunning results. People can still continue articulating some words while whistling and there is a high understandability rate while communicating. Therefore, it is described as an incomplete form of the Turkish Language. The research results also indicate that Turkish Whistle Language is a non-tonal language transposing formants and therefore, it can be used to evaluate the formant changes in the transform of a language. These research results indicate many other valuable properties of Turkish whistle language. Meyer (2015) says that Turkish is the Language of the second category with the highest number of vowels and consonants. As its whistled form is still practiced in the village of Kusköy and by the shepherds going in summer in the high plateaus, it can provide reliable data for careful analysis. Even if several attempts to unravel the Turkish whistled system have been made, they have not explained how the vowel harmony balances the phonetic vowel reduction rules specific to Turkish phonology. Moreover none of them have detailed how the amplitude and frequency modulations combine to produce the consonants. The present study is based on data recorded in Kusköy in 1967 by an expedition organized by Busnel and on new material recorded in 2003 by the author. This large corpus of vowels and consonants enables an unprecedented statistical analysis for the study of whistled languages.

Shirshova (2018) say: The language policy of the Republic of Tatarstan continually attracts the attention of experts, but it is evaluated differently in various segments of public discourse. Polar judgments range from recognizing Tatarstan as a positive model of "peaceful cultural pluralism in Russia" (Graney, 2007) to sharply condemning it for nationalism, language discrimination, and even separatism (<https://yandex.ru>). In the first case, the non-confrontational and com-

promise-oriented strategy of the Tatarstan authorities is emphasized. Comparative regional studies do not confirm and confidently refute accusations of discrimination based on the ethnolinguistic principle. For example, in Tatarstan and Bashkortostan, xenophobia in the labor market is lower than in Moscow and St. Petersburg. Scholars made a special note of the fact that ethnic groups in the republics mentioned above "do not consider each other a potential threat", and ethnic Russians do not perceive Kazan and Ufa "as an autochthonous Russian territory".

### 3. METHODS

The research has utilized interpretive, stylistic, and comparative approaches. Such methods interpret the descriptive approach as a perpetual sampling approach, processing method, interpretation, semantic, and lexical analysis. The stylistic approach is focused essentially on the semantic and contextual investigation of linguistic stereotypes and national cultural connotations. The comparative-contrastive investigation of ethnocultural stereotypes of the Tatars and the Turks' communicative behavior aids in obtaining several similar characteristics and many differences defined by the national identity of mentality and culture.

The methodological foundation of the research is also linguoculturological and cognitive features of the investigation of paroemiological units. Linguocultural analysis of proverbs reveals culturally specific markers of the speech behavior of the Turks and Tatars. The cognitive method permits us to discover the national in communication and to expose its national-cultural specificity. The techniques and methods utilized in the survey are defined by cross-cutting review.

### 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Regardless of faith, origin, and social situation, the Tatars treat the interlocutor warmly and considerately. The chief mental features of the Tatars also include latitude and tolerance. All these essential characteristics of ethnic groups are displayed in speech culture.

Linguistic performance, plays a significant role in the construction of Tatar identity: this performance can be both for outsiders, such as fieldworkers or unknown members of large audiences, and for insiders, such as members of a small social network. Broadly speaking, Tatar identity appears to be defined in opposition to Russian, such that the focus is less on what Tatars are and more on what they are not and what they are not is

Russian. In this context, with an oppositional definition, the pure Tatar individual comes to mean the de-Russified Tatar individual, one who has removed Russian influence from his or her life (Wertheim, 2008). Building the thesaurus is aimed at fixing all Tatar single words and multiword items related to the socio-political sphere with their Russian equivalents. A distinguishing feature of the contemporary Tatar lexicon is a great deal of absolute synonyms which emerged due to a combination of intralinguistic and extralinguistic factors. Corpus data prove that synonymy in socio-political terminology is rather an artificial and superficial phenomenon. Currently most Tatar socio-political terms are coined by calquing the corresponding Russian terms, and lexical preferences of translators and terminology developers may differ, which leads to a large number of competing items of different origin and structure. On the level of multiword items, lexical variation is complicated by the factor of syntactic variation, which in its turn multiplies the number of synonymous compounds. Parallel nominations are used for a wide range of phenomena, including official names of state structures and social institutions (Galieva, 2018).

According to several recent opinion polls, conducted regularly by the World Congress of Tatars partner organizations as part of their socio-cultural monitoring activities, the Tatar language is viewed by the majority of Kazaners as a marker of national identity, of belonging to the Tatar culture which is connected with the notions of "national heritage", "uniqueness", "local flavour", "traditions and customs". Therefore the instances of using Tatar names serve the pragmatic function of representing these notions and values in the business world. The Tatar Language being the second official language of the Republic of Tatarstan, is widely represented as a doubling one in company names and road signs, especially the ones that were put up during the period of Tatarstan's national self-identification in 1990-2000s. We believe that stereotypes about the Tatar people, their speech culture, and communicative behavior are formed through paroemias and phraseological units. Analyzing these units based on the correlation of their figurative perceptions with the stereotypes that reflect ethnopsychological traits and national mentality, we can identify their cultural and national significance of expression, which is the national-cultural content connotation.

1. In linguistic cultures, a specific category of communicative behavior is sociability, such as inter-relating, promoting contacts, and interpersonal talents. To build good relationships with people around, one

must listen, analyze, interpret the interlocutor's speech and influence. In speech culture, characteristics like the ability to arrange, listen, and coincide in opinion are appreciated.

While paroemias' analysis confirms, the Turks and the Tatars in conversation are open, warm, honest, competent, and sociable. There are many proverbs regarding the significance of the word in Tatar and Turkish linguistic cultures. For instance, *Тел - байлык (Language is affluence)*; *Тел күрке - сүз (literally: Value of a word is Language)*; *Dilin cirmi küçük, cürmü büyük (The very tongue is small but mistakes are great)*; *Baş dille tartılır (The tongue estimates the head)*.

The proverbs state that the art of oracy benefits to improve and sustain relationships. An individual needs to be able to learn the skills of speech culture. As a way of example, *Сүз сөйләү – һөнәр, сөйли белмәгән үләр (Conversing is a profession, people who can't speak will perish)*; *Yerinde söz söylemesini bilen özür dilemek zorunda kalmaz (Person, who is able to speak a word in season does not have to look for forgiveness)*.

A sociable person enjoys authority, generates sympathy, and is well regarded in the community: *Суны таяк белән, кешене тел белән үлчиләр (A stick measures water, and a language measures a man)*; *Ат кешнәшәп белешә, адәм сөйләшәп таныша (Its neigh may recognize horse, man is known by speaking)*. It is outstanding that in Tatar linguistic, the capacity to hold one's word, to convey on one's promise is extremely valued: *Сүзне әйтмә, әйтсәң – кайтма (Do not say a word, having said – stand your ground)*.

Restraint is the most important category of speech behavior of the Tatars and Turks. The ability to show restraint and control your speech, to be as good as your word, is considered the leading quality of successful speech communication.

In the speech, the phraseological units with the meaning "keep a still tongue in the head" are actively used, which once again speaks for the high importance of the category of restraint in the Tatars and the Turks' speech culture. The ability to be particular in speech has formed qualities such as "keep the word," "to mean what one says."

As the analysis of paroemias shows, in the Tatar communicative culture, one needs to be moderate and

reasonable. Before to say a word, you need to think, analyze your speech: *Әүвәл уйла, аннары сөйлә* (*Think then say*); *Бар белгәнеңне сөйләргә ашыкма* (*Hold off telling all what you know*); *Boğaz dokuz (kırık) boşumdur* (*There are nine (forty) nodes in the throat*); *Sözünü bil, pişir; ağzını der, devşir* (*Wrap your mind around the word then say it*) and so on.

2. The culture of communication plays an important role in the communicative behavior of the Tatars and the Turks. In the culture of communication, person's manners, intellect, and respectful attitude to the interlocutor are manifested. The ability to hold conversation at all times was considered the highest art. The ability to speak, listen, hear and understand the interlocutor's speech is the basis of a communication culture.

Mastery of conversation means the use of positive qualities of speech such as accuracy, appropriateness, wealth, brevity and truthfulness. In the Tatar and Turkish linguistic cultures, a kind, good, affectionate word is greatly appreciated. As the analysis of proverbs shows, the Tatar and Turkish linguistic cultures evaluate the ability to listen to the interlocutor, it is forbidden to interrupt: *Белмичә сөйләгәнче, белгәннең сүзен тыңлау яхшы* (*literally: It is better to listen to one who knows than to tell about something you don't know anything.*); *İstediğini söyleyen istemediğini işitir* (*he who says what he likes, shall hear what he doesn't like*) and so on.

In the Tatar linguistic culture, the ability to start a conversation rightly, ask questions is a valuable quality of speech culture: *Ничек эндәшсәң, шундый җавап* (*As you give, you receive*); *Соравына күрә җавабы* (*As the question so the answer*) and so on.

It should be noted that humor should be appropriate for the situation in the Tatar linguistic culture, and in the Turkish linguistic culture, preference is given to serious conversation. If the interlocutor decided to joke, then their joke should be appropriate and tactful: *Уен сүзгә мәгънә кирәк* (*Every joke should be meaningful*); *Уйнап әйтсәң дә уйлап әйт* (*Literally: If you speak in jest do it in an intelligent way*) and so on.

3. Politeness is one of the chief communicative classes of the Tatars and the Turks. By courtesy, they understand the ability to communicate with people respectfully and delicately, to reach a compromise. The custom of courtesy is correlated with such qualities as mannerliness, courtesy, and wisdom: *Акыллы кеше*

*сүз әйткәндә, әйтәр сүзән чамалар* (*An intelligent person knows what to say*); *Инсафлының теле саф* (*A man of fine breeding always uses polite words*); *Ачtırma кутуу, сөyletme kötüyü* (*Don't force out to open a box, do not force out to say mean things (to bring to mind)*) and so on.

The National Corpus of the Tatar Language can be viewed as a set of conceptual and functional models of different levels of the Tatar language. The class of conceptual and functional models includes structural and functional descriptions of a certain linguistic level (or levels), as well as different types of general information, which is necessary for developing of information systems and technologies of natural language processing. The corpus is an open system, therefore it permits the expansion of the annotation system (currently only grammatical annotation is used). The Tatar Corpus contains texts of different genres and styles of the modern literary Tatar language. The main sources of electronic copies of texts for the corpus are fictional texts, educational and scientific literature, texts of Internet publications on informative, social and political themes and texts of official documents. In the future we plan to reinforce the chronological and genre balance of the corpus, i.e. through digitalization of printed texts of the Soviet period (Graney, 2007). The conducted research revealed that Tatar cosmonyms can be classified into three large groups: 1) cosmonyms of Turkic-Tatar origin; 2) cosmonyms borrowed from Arabic; 3) cosmonyms borrowed from the Indo-European languages (Greek, Latin) through Russian. In the Tatar linguistic culture a kind, good, fair-spoken, meaningful word is valued highly: *Яхшы сүз балдан татлы* (*A good word is honeysweet*); *Татлы тел тимер капканы да ачар* (*Sweet nothings will open iron gates*); *Җайлы сүз жан зрәтә* (*A sensible word heartens*); *Җылы сүз – жан азыгы* (*A soft word – soul food*).

4. Talkativeness is criticized by the Turkic individuals since they believe "that those who talk too much, boast, one cannot believe and rely on them." As the analysis of paroemias shows, in both linguistic cultures, talkativeness is a communicative category, which is opposed to restraint: *Теленә салынган эшендә абынган* (*One who talks too much will not do the deed*). These paroemias mean that those who talk much, boast cannot be trusted and relied on them.

Briefness, the strength to contemplate each word also describe the communicative culture of the Tatars: *Аз сөйләгән аз ялгышыр* (*They who say least are little*

mistaken); Бep сүз аз, ике сүз күп (One word is not enough, two words are plenty). Short speech, silence in communication are indicative of a man's being wise and serious-minded in action. Silence is appreciated: Сөйләвең көмеш булса да, дөшмәвең алтын (Speech is silver, silence is gold); Söz gümüş sükut altın (no wisdom like silence) and so on.

5. Effective communication is a significant category of communicative behavior in Tatar and Turkish paroemias. Such features as openness, honesty, soulfulness are the foremost principles for efficient communication in Tatar speech: *Тел, күңел көзгәсе (The Language is the mirror of the soul); Йөрәктән чыкмаган йөрәккә житмәс (A word having said not with all heart does not reach the heart).*

The characteristic ethnically marked features of Tatar speech behavior can be considered warmth and sincerity: кайнар сәламнәр житкерү (extend warm greetings), жылы әңгәмә, жылы кабул итү (receive warmly), күзгә-күз карап сөйләшү (speak frankly), ачыктан-ачык сөйләшү (speak one's mind). The connotation of such phraseological units is based on such traits of character of the Tatar ethnic group as sincerity, openness, warmth. Sincerity, frankness, truthfulness are also positive qualities in the speech culture of the Tatars: турысын әйтү, турыдан бәрү, туры ярып әйтү (to say straight to one's face), дәрәс сүзгә жавап юк (there is nothing to answer to a true word). Seeing once is more important than hearing: әйтүгә генә жиңел (speak seamlessly).

In a forthcoming culture, an individual should expose their feelings concisely and openly. There is a high frequency of phraseological units with negative connotations "he can't string several words together", "weak at language", which shows the importance of the ability to formulate one's speech. In a conversation, the Tatars try not to offend the interlocutor, show reverence, do not interrupt.

Straightforwardness and honesty are the traits important enough for speech culture: Телнең зиннәте – тугры сүз (A true word is an adornment of the Language); Туры сүзгә ант кирәкми (literally: A true word does not need an oath); *Doğru söyleyenin bir ayağı üzengide gerek (One who is speaking the truth has his foot set into stirrups); Dost acı söyler (A friend will tell a bitter truth)* and so on. In the Tatar ethnic culture, conflict communication is revealed through lies, quarrels, and insults. Lying and boasting, quarrel and gossip are considered bad qualities of a person and

are strictly condemned in the speech culture of the Tatars. Tatar paroemias urge not to quarrel, but to avoid them: Ызгыш - дошманлыкның башы (Quarrel is the beginning of animosity); Гафу үтенгәнче, ызгышмау яхшы (Better not abuse one another than to apologize); Ачулансаң да, соңгысын әйтмә (If you are even irritated, don't speak bad Language). In Tatar speech behavior silence is considered to be discontinuation of the quarrel: Дәшми торсаң, талаш бетә (Say nothing – no quarrel). The Tatars and the Turks condemn lie and gossip: Гайбәт чәйнәгәнче, сагыз чәйнә (Better to chew than to talk scandal); Adam adamı bir kere aldatır (A man may have deceived another only once (the second time is impossible)).

The analysis of Tatar and Turkish proverbs and phraseological units with the meaning of speech shows that they express cultural and value orientations of the ethnos. Paroemias express such positive orientations as being truthful, eloquent, sincere, restrained, honest, moderate, silent and such negative orientations as boastful, talkative.

## 5. CONCLUSION

The investigation of proverbs and phraseological parts concludes that the Tatars and the Turks' ethnocultural stereotypes of communicative behavior are exhibited in the phraseological method. The vital categories of unified communication within the Tatars and the Turks are humility, discipline, respect, openness, honesty, and regard. For truth over lie, preference is presented for deed over words, silence over talkativeness, and silence over speaking. Nonetheless, the speech culture of each ethnos is various, sole, and original. The Tatar communication culture is pure, natural, emotional. The Tatars usually strike up a conversation in order to bestow consideration for an interlocutor. The Turks in communicative behavior are extremely respectful and polite, constantly warm, and welcoming. They tend to attach tremendous significance to etiquette.

The Tatars and the Turks' communicative culture indicates ancient cultures, traditions, attitudes, beliefs of the people, and profound linguistic-cultural experience. From our standpoint, a systematic examination and classification of ethnocultural stereotypes of the communicative behavior of the Turkish and Tatars in synchrony and diachrony can be assured in the realm of linguoculturology, linguistics, ethics as well as cultural studies.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The survey is conducted base on the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan University.

## REFERENCES

- Abdulin, A.A. (2006). Ethic Expressions in Modern Literary Language. *Author's Dissertation for Candidate of Philology. Kazan*, 25 p.
- Busnel, R.G. (1976). Whistled Languages. Berlin: Springer Verlag: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-46335-8>
- Dunbar, R. I. (2003). The Origin and Subsequent Evolution of Language. *Studies In The Evolution Of Language*, 3, 219-234. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199244843.003.0012>
- Galieva, A. (2018). Synonymy in Modern Tatar reflected by the Tatar-Russian Socio-Political Thesaurus, Tatarstan Academy of Sciences.
- Gilazetdinova, G. K., Edikhanov, I. Z., & Aminova, A. A. (2014). Problems of Ethno-Cultural Identity and Cross-Language Communication. *Journal of Language And Literature*, 5(3), 39-42. <https://doi.org/10.7813/jil.2014/5-3/7>
- Graney, K. (2007). Making Russia multicultural. Kazan at its Millennium and beyond, in *Problems of Post-Communism*, 54(6). <https://doi.org/10.2753/PPC1075-8216540602>
- Güntürkün, O., Güntürkün, M., & Hahn, C. (2015). Whistled Turkish alters language asymmetries. *Current Biology*, 25(16), R706-R708. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2015.06.067>
- Isina, G.I. (2008). Stereotypes and National Linguistic World image. *Author's Dissertation for Candidate of Philology. Almaty*, 55 p.
- Jobo, M.M. (2016). The Prejudiced Negative Images of Femininity in Wolaita Proverbs. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*. 4(1), 58-68
- Kolosova, E. I. (2016). Variation in the verb formation in the Russian Language. *Current Issues of the Russian Language Teaching XII*. Brno: Masary ova Univerzita.
- Koneva, Ekaterina (2014). The Role of Comparative Analysis in Foreign Language Learning (German and Russian languages), *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 154, License: CC BY-NC-ND 3.0. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.10.156>
- Kuznetsov, A.V. (2004). Verbal Means of Etiquette Communication in the Chuvash Language: The Comparative, Contrastive and Ethnolinguocultural Studies. *Author's Dissertation for Candidate of Philology. Cheboksary*, 25 p.
- Meyer, J. (2015). Whistled Languages: A Worldwide Inquiry on Human Whistled Speech. Berlin: Springer-Verlag. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-45837-2>
- Mugtasimova, G. R., Nabiullina, G. A., & Denmukhametova, E. N. (2014). Paremiological fund of the Tatar people in the ethnolinguistic aspect. *Life Science Journal*, 11(11), 409-412.
- Ozaydin, S. (2017). Comparative Analysis of Early Studies on Turkish Whistle Language and a Case Study on Test Conditions, *Journal of Modern Linguistics* 08(04). <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2018.84013>
- Quasthoff, U. (1978). The Uses of Stereotype in Everyday Argument. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 2(1), 1-48. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(78\)90021-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(78)90021-8)
- Safin, I. K., Kolosova, E. I., & Bychkova, T. A. (2016). Specifics of Teaching Grammar in the bilingual education conditions. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods (MJLTM)*, Special Issue.
- Saifullina, E.R. (2009). Cognitive Sphere of Russian a Tatar Paroemias: "Language Image" and the Rhetorical Norms. *Author's Dissertation for Candidate of Philology. Ufa*.
- Shirshova, V. (2018). Employers-racists: how Kazan and Ufa overtook Moscow and St. Petersburg in tolerance. *Real time*. June 8.
- Sibgaeva, F.R., Nurmukhametova, R.S., Sattarova, M.R., & Smagulova, G.N. (2017). Man as an object of evaluation in the phraseological picture of the world (on the material of Tatar language). *AD ALTA – Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, 7(2), 267-269.
- Sibgaeva, F.R., Zamaletdinova, G.F., & Nurmukhametova, R.S. (2016). Linguoculturological specific features of phraseological units of the Tatar language. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, 116-119.
- Underwood, E. (2015). Whistled Turkish Tickles Both Sides of the Brain. *Science*, August. [https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2015/08/whistled-turkish-tickles-both-sides-brain?utm\\_source=facebook&utm\\_medium=social&utm\\_campaign=facebook](https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2015/08/whistled-turkish-tickles-both-sides-brain?utm_source=facebook&utm_medium=social&utm_campaign=facebook) (Access Date 11.25. 2019.) <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aad1630>
- Wertheim, S. (2008). language "purity" and the de-russification of Tatar, University of California, Berkeley.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1992). Semantics, Culture, and Cognition: Universal Human Concepts In Culture-Specific Configurations. *Oxford University Press On Demand*.

Received on 25-10-2020

Accepted on 01-12-2020

Published on 30-12-2020

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.6000/1929-4409.2020.09.297>

© 2020 Edikhanov et al.; Licensee Lifescience Global.

This is an open access article licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/>) which permits unrestricted, non-commercial use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the work is properly cited.